## Case 3:15-cr-00579-VC Document 68 Filed 12/17/15 Page 1 of 1

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	) Case No. CR 15-574 EMC
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Roymondo Boral Duran	DEC 17 2015
Defendant.	SUSANY SOONG
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on 12/17, 2015, the Court excludent the Speedy Trial Act from 12/17, 2015 to 1/15/16, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance wou See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ald be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of th	lex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial
itself within the time limits establi	ished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ald deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, f due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ald unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given mmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	ald unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time a, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 12-17-18	Savi in
	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrate Judge
STIP <del>ULATE</del> D:	

Attorney for Defendant

Assistant United States Attorney